

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MARIYAM AKMAL,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 BOEING COMMERCIAL AIRPLANES, et
14 al.,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. C18-697 RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME AND ORDER
TO SHOW CAUSE

17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time. Dkt.
18 #12. Plaintiff Mariyam Akmal filed this action on May 14, 2018, and her Complaint was filed
19 on the docket four days later. *See* Dkts. #1–5. She has named as Defendants “Boeing
20 Commercial Airplanes” and several individuals associated with Boeing. Dkt. #5. No Defendant
21 has appeared. On August 21, 2018, the Court issued an Order setting initial disclosure and joint
22 status report deadlines. Dkt. #11. The instant Motion was filed on September 3, 2018.
23

24 Despite the significant amount of time that has elapsed since this case was opened,
25 Plaintiff states that she has “just this week” found an attorney who may be able to represent her.
26 Dkt. #12 at 1. Plaintiff indicates she believes she had 120 days to serve Defendants from the
27 time she filed this action. She now moves the Court for an additional 120 days to serve, and for
28

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME AND ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE - 1

1 a corresponding extension of the initial disclosure and joint status report deadlines. *Id.* at 2.
2 Plaintiff sets forth no explanation for her failure to serve Defendants up to this point, and no basis
3 or explanation for why she needs the additional time.

4 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) states in part:

5 If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is
6 filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the
7 plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice or order that
8 service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows
9 good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service
for an appropriate period.

10 Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Several years ago, this rule was changed to reduce the time for service
11 from 120 days to 90 days, effective December 1, 2015.

12 Plaintiff has not set forth any basis for an extension of the Court’s joint status report and
13 initial disclosure deadlines and that request will be denied. Those deadlines can be reset in the
14 future if necessary. More importantly, it appears Plaintiff has not served defendants within the
15 time limit set by Rule 4(m). Under that rule, the Court must dismiss this action without prejudice
16 or order that service be made within a specific time, “unless plaintiff shows good cause for the
17 failure.” The Court will offer Plaintiff an opportunity to explain the delay in service.

18
19 In Response to this Order, Plaintiff must write a short statement telling the Court why the
20 time limit for service should be extended in this case. This Response may not exceed **six (6)**
21 **pages**.

22
23 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
24 finds and ORDERS:

25 1) Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. #12) is DENIED.
26
27
28

2) Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause no later than **fourteen (14) days** from the date of this Order. Failure to file will result in dismissal of this case.

DATED this 7th day of September 2018.

W. S. J.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE